

Remarks:

Reconsideration of the application, as amended herein, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 - 8 are presently pending in the application. Claims 1, 5 and 8 have been amended. Applicant gratefully acknowledges that claim 5 has been indicated as being allowable if rewritten to include all the limitations of the claims from which that claims depends. Claim 5 has been amended herein to include all of the limitations of claim 1, from which it originally depended, as well as the limitations of claim 4. As such, it is believed that claim 5 is in condition for immediate allowance.

On page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,104,841 to Suh ("SUH").

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 2, 3, 4 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by SUH. On page 4 of the Office Action, claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by SUH.

Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejections, as applied to the amended claims.

Applic. No. 10/690,301

Response Dated October 4, 2005

Responsive to Office Action of August 4, 2005

More particularly, amended claim 1 now recites, among other limitations:

a plurality of field effect transistors for driving the output by leading a current to or away from the output,

with a ratio between the channel widths of at least two field effect transistors, which both act either for leading current to or away from the output, being constant and set in dependence on the value of the voltage difference. [emphasis added by Applicant]

Applicant's independent claim 8 has been amended to recite similar limitations. As stated in the previous response, which Applicant maintains and reasserts in its entirety, by reference, SUH discloses that the ratios of the channel width of the field-effect transistors of a driver stage are set independently of the value of the voltage difference between the n-output levels. This can be seen clearly from Tables 1, 3, 6 and 7 of SUH, where it is shown that varying the voltage difference  $\Delta V$  in SUH does not influence the channel width ratio. In contrast to the teachings of SUH, Applicant's claims require, among other limitations, that the relationship of the channel width of the field-effect transistors of the driver stage are set depending on the value of the voltage difference among the n-output levels.

Applic. No. 10/690,001

Response Dated October 4, 2005

Responsive to Office Action of August 4, 2005

In response to this argument, on page 4 of the Office Action, it is stated:

The examiner further notes that the statement, "the ratios of the channel width of the field-effect transistors", is not found in claim languages. The applicant further argues that the dependence between the channel width and voltage is a general relationship for individual channel width settings and not directed to a relationship between two different channel widths. The examiner notes that SUH reference teaches all the broadly claimed limitations of the instant application; "the relationship of the channel widths of at least two field effect transistors . . . , being set in dependence on the value of the voltage difference" where four transistors having its own channel widths determines the output voltage of the driver as well as the output voltage of the driver is determined (i.e., depended) by the channel widths being selected by the Datax and Datay as discussed in col. 5, line 28 - col. 6, line 47 of the specification. [emphasis added by Applicant]

Notwithstanding the above argument of the Office Action, that SUH allegedly teaches the "relationship of the channel widths", varying the voltage difference  $\Delta V$  in SUH does not influence the channel width ratio, as stated by the Applicant in the previous response. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 8 herein to even more clearly recite, among other limitations:

with a ratio between the channel widths of at least two field effect transistors, which both act either for leading current to or away from the output, being constant and set in dependence on the value of the voltage difference.

The above limitations of Applicant's claims, among others, are clearly neither taught, nor suggested, by SUH. Rather, in

Applic. No. 10/690,001

Response Dated October 4, 2005

Responsive to Office Action of August 4, 2005

SUH, the selection for turning on the push and pull transistors is dependent on the voltage level desired at the output of the driver stage, but independent of the voltage difference between these voltage levels. As such, in SUH, even if the selection among the push and pull transistors were dependent on the data values Datax and Datay (Fig. 6A of SUH), this would not lead to a relationship/ratio between the channel widths of those transistors being set in dependence on the value of the voltage difference between the different voltage levels, as required by Applicant's amended claims 1 and 8.

Note also that Applicant's amended claims 1 and 8 clarify that the ratio between the channel widths is constant and set in dependence on the value of the voltage difference. These limitations of Applicant's claims, among others, are neither taught, nor suggested, by SUH.

It is accordingly believed that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, teach or suggest the features of claims 1, 5 and 8. Claims 1, 5 and 8 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 1.

Applic. No. 10/690,001

Response Dated October 4, 2005

Responsive to Office Action of August 4, 2005


In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 - 8 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out. In the alternative, the entry of the amendment is requested, as it is believed to place the application in better condition for appeal, without requiring extension of the field of search.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Please charge any fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

  
For Applicant

Kerry P. Sisselman  
Reg. No. 37,237

October 4, 2005

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.  
Post Office Box 2480  
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480  
Tel: (954) 925-1100  
Fax: (954) 925-1101